DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 274 978 CS 210 067

AUTHOR Dozier, David M.
TITLE The Environmental Scanning Function of Public Relations Practitioners and Participation in Management Decision Making.
PUB DATE 5 Aug 86
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (69th, Norman, OK, August 3-6, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Research; Evaluation Problems; *Organizational Communication; Organizational Theories; *Participative Decision Making; Program Evaluation; Public Opinion; *Public Relations; Research Methodology; *Role Perception; Role Theory; Systems Approach
IDENTIFIERS *Environmental Scanning

ABSTRACT

Focusing on the concepts of scanning (gathering information about segments of the public, their reactions to the organization, and their opinions about issues important to the organization), decision making, and roles, a study examined the relationship between environmental scanning and the participation of public relations practitioners in management decision making. The 1985 membership directories for the Public Relations Society of America and the International Association of Business Communicators formed the sample frame and a questionnaire was mailed to 400 members, with a 34.8% response rate. Factor scales for environmental scanning indicated how frequently the practitioner engaged in each environmental scanning activity. An index for participation in management decision making outlined the variables and the hypotheses tested. Findings showed that both scientific and informal scanning were positively and significantly correlated with the practitioner's managerial role activities, while neither type of scanning was correlated with the practitioner's technical role activities. Some correlation existed between the technical role scale and scientific scanning. Data showed the relationship between scientific and informal scanning and management decision making to be strong, even after the influence of managerial role playing by the practitioner was controlled. (Rival models for scanning, roles, and decision making are discussed, and tables of data are included.) (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Public Relations Division

ED274978

THE ENVIRONMENTAL SCANNING FUNCTION OF PUBLIC RELATIONS PRACTITIONERS AND PARTICIPATION IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING

By

David M. Dozier, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Journalism
San Diego State University
San Diego, California 92182-0116

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David M. Dozier

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 210067

Paper presented to the Public Relations Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication Annual Convention, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, August 5, 1986.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author greatly appreciates the assistance of Richard Curtis, Rodney Dunham, Val Jacobs, Mike Steele, and Tom Valente for their tireless efforts to organize and implement this research project. All five are graduate students at San Diego State University.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL SCANNING FUNCTION OF PUBLIC RELATIONS PRACTITIONERS AND PARTICIPATION IN MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING

Environmental scanning (sometimes called environmental monitoring) is the gathering of information about publics, about reactions of publics toward the organization, and about public opinion toward issues important to the organization. Public relations practitioners vary in the amount of time they spend learning "what's going on out there." Participation in management decision making is frequently the goal of practitioners who seek to guide their organizations around potential public relations problems, rather than straighten such problems out after strategic errors have been made. Practitioners play different roles in organizations. Generally, practitioners play either the manager or the technician role predominantly. These three concepts--scanning, decision making, and roles--are useful in explaining why some practitioners are lower-level technicians who crank out communications about the organization in isolation from management decision making while other practitioners are high-level participants in organizational decision making and problem solving.

John A. Koten, vice president for corporate communications at Illinois Bell, summed up the relation between scanning and participation in management decision making:1

> ...to be influential, you have to be at the decision table and be part of corporate governance. You can be there if the things you are doing are supported by facts, case histories, and so forth. That is where the public relations person has generally been weak and why, in most organizations, public relations functions at a lower level.... The idea is to be where decisions are made in order to impact the future of the company. To do so, you have to be like the lawyer or financial officer, the personnel officer or operations person. You have to have hard data to be there. All of these guys are operating with information. If public relations people want to be there and participate, then they need to have some hard data to work with. Since most of them don't have hard information, they're never part of decision making.

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between environmental scanning, the source of much of the hard data that Koten described, and the participation of public relations practitioners in management decision making. The significance of this relationship between decision making and environmental scanning can be best understood when organizations are viewed as open systems.

Public Relations from a Systems Perspective

Viewed from an open systems perspective, public relations is part of the adaptive subsystem of the organization.2 This subsystem engages in boundary spanning activities, gathering information from outside the organization's boundary to help the organization adapt to its environment.

Public relations has traditionally functioned as if organizations were closed systems. Practitioners who treat their organizations as closed systems, according to Cutlip, Center and Broom, are like the cuttlefish. A simple-minded squidlike mollusk, the cuttlefish squirts ink indiscrimately when

threatened by environmental turbulence, regardless of the nature of the threat.[3] Bell and Bell describe such public relations practitioners as functionaries, who "attempt to preserve and promote a favorable image of the organization" without regard to the dynamics of changing organizational environments. They note that such a practitioner "does not function in decision making or even in advisory roles in relation to environmental concerns."[4]

Systems theory encourages both researchers and practitioners to look at the public relations function from a new perspective. Instead of maintaining a one-way flow of messages outward from the organization, practitioners are encouraged to look at their role as information gatherers, as part of the organization's adaptive subsystem.

Inherent in this notion of adaption is the view that the organization itself must change in order to maintain its goal states or homeostasis. Paradoxically, organizations as open systems must change themselves in order to endure. When an organization alters its structure and function, the process is called morphogenesis by systems theorists. Applied to public relations, elements of morphogenesis appear in Cutlip, Center and Broom's action strategies. Action strategies make up one part of the planning process. These strategies are steps taken by practitioners and others in the organization to "change the organization's policies, procedures, products, services and behavior to better serve the mutual interests of the organization and its publics."[5]

Grunig and Hunt have labeled such morphogenesis within

organizations initiated by public relations practitioners as the two-way symmetric public relations model.[6] Unlike the two-way asymmetric model, where organizations attempt to dominate and control their environments, the two-way symmetric model presumes that organizations cooperate and adapt to interpenetrating publics that affect the organization's survival and growth. Both two-way models differ from traditional publicity and public information practices in that information is collected by the practitioner from the environment to contribute to management decision making. Two-way symmetric public relations practices, as typified by action strategies in the planning process, require practitioner participation in management decision making.

Communication and Impact on Publics

Concern with and involvement in management decision making is driven by practical concerns. Mass communication research over the last 40 years has provided evidence of an obstinate audience not easily influenced by the news releases and special events of public relations practitioners. Cutlip, Center, and Broom note that publics form opinions about organizations according to the publics' self interest.[7] Efforts to convince publics to favor organizational behavior contrary to their own best interests usually fail. Such failure is likely to be viewed as a failure of the public relations effort.

The difficulty of achieving impact on publics through mass communication is illustrated through Grunig and Hunt's "domino theory" of communication effects.[8] The domino model

conceptualizes the elements of message, knowledge, attitude, and behavior as a row of dominos. The practitioner can initiate messages to publics with some certainty of success, but the message may not impact knowledge, may not "knock down" the next domino. Further, knowledge change will not necessarily impact attitudes, and attitude change may not impact behavior. Public impact is problematic in the modern, cluttered information environment, where practitioner messages must compete with many other forms of mass and interpersonal communication.

Strategic Significance of Making Decisions

Organizations sometime act in a manner counter to the best interests of interpenetrating publics. Such organizations often ask public relations practitioners to coerce or dominate such publics, to "bring them in line" with the organization's will. Such practices typify two-way asymmetric public relations Yet prudent practitioners know that such efforts to persuade publics to think, feel, and act counter to their own best interests are doomed. Such practitioners avoid public relations campaigns that can't work.

Preventing public relations problems is often easier than "putting out fires" after bad decisions are made and inappropriate actions are taken. Proactive public relations practitioners seek to guide organizations around conflicts with interpenetrating publics that can affect organizational survival and growth.

The net effect may be that the organization behaves in a

socially responsible manner. The motivation for such behavior, however, does not necessarily spring from some higher ethical standards of public relations practitioners. Rather, such socially responsible behavior, such efforts to cooperate with interpenetrating publics, is driven by the strategic self-interest of proactive public relations practitioners.

If practitioners can guide organizations toward decisions that incorporate the mutual interests of organizations and publics, then success is within reach. Practitioners then need only effectively communicate that the organization is acting in a manner consistent with the best interests of publics involved.

On the other hand, practitioners may fail to guide organizations toward mutually beneficial decisions. Either through ignorance or design, organizational actions may conflict with interests of key publics. Practitioners will be asked to use the somewhat limited tools of mass communication to dominate publics, to convince them to think, feel, and act counter to the publics' best interests.

Proactive practitioners find it in their interest to participate in management decision making and to guide organizational decisions toward mutually beneficial policies, procedures and actions. The alternative is to "put out fires" or unravel serious public relations conflicts that should not have occurred.

Practitioner Roles and Decision Making

Broom and Dozier report a six-year panel study of public relations practitioners that link participation in management decision making to higher salaries and practitioner roles.[9] Public relations practitioners play two basic roles in organizations. The public relations technician role involves the production of messages about the organization, the handling of all aspects of the communication output function. Such practitioners earn low salaries and are systematically excluded from management decision making. Public relations managers, on the other hand, are regarded as organizational experts on public relations. They make policy decisions and are held accountable for public relations program success or failure. Managers are included in management decision making; they generally earn more money than technicians. This is true, even when the influence of years of professional experience is controlled.

Broom and Dozier also hypothesized that practitioners who evaluated the impact of public relations programs would be more likely to participate in management decision making. They used a three-factor model of program evaluation styles based on an earlier study by Dozier.[10] One style, the scientific impact style, employs cross-sectional surveys, focus group studies, secondary analysis of data collected by commercial survey research firms, and tabulation of complaints from publics to measure the impact of public relations programs. The second style, the seat-of-pants style of evaluation, uses informal techniques to evaluate the preparation, dissemination, and impact

of public relations programs. Such techniques include personal media contacts, conversations with other practitioners, attending public meetings, and "keeping my eyes and ears open." These two styles closely parallel the seat-of-pants/scientific dichotomy first drawn by Robinson in his seminal work on public relations research.[11] The third style of evaluation, the scientific dissemination style, consists of sophisticated measures of clip files and content analysis of media coverage.

In the panel study, Broom and Dozier found a weak but significant correlation between a practitioner's use of the combined styles of program evaluation and participation in management decision making. This relationship was expected because practitioners who measure the effectiveness of their programs are in a good position to advise management on policy alternatives. Such practitioners would know what "works" and what does not, in terms of public relations programs. Access to the decision-making core is limited to those members of the organization who can meaningfully contribute to the quality of decisions. The weak correlation ($r=+.11$) can be explained in part by the relatively infrequent use of either scientific impact, seat-of-pants, or scientific dissemination evaluation by practitioners in the study.[12]

The Problems with Program Evaluation

Grunig perhaps most eloquently described the status of public relations practice and program evaluation. Grunig lamented, "I have begun to feel more and more like the

fundamentalist minister railing against sin; the difference being that I have railed for evaluation" in public relations practice. "Just as everyone is against sin, so most public relations people I talk to are for evaluation. People keep on sinning, however, and PR people continue not to do evaluation research."[13]

Center and Broom point to deficiencies among senior practitioners as the root cause of the neglect of evaluation research in public relations.[14]

> We suspect from personal experience and observation--and some of the research reported in public relations literature supports our suspicions--that most of the practitioners positioned by age or authority to be influential in these matters simply do not know how to provide leadership to use research in planning, monitoring and evaluating programs. Not knowing and not having engaged in research that would have established some benchmarks from which to measure, it is simply easier to run out the career string as is...

While a remarkable amount of lip service is paid to the importance of program evaluation in public relations, the rhetorical line is much more impressive than the results. The use of intuitive measures of impact and "clip file" statistics has been branded "pseudo-evaluation."[15]

The problem with evaluation research is that such studies are among the most sophisticated research activities that a practitioner can undertake. In program evaluation, clearly-defined, quantified objectives must be set in terms of the change or maintenance of knowledge, attitudes, and behavior of publics. A longitudinal design must be established to measure the impact variable before and after program implementation. Experimental or quasi-experimental designs, using control groups and

comparison groups respectively, are required to isolate program effects from the confounding influences of various threats to internal validity. In short, as Reeves argued, the "bad news is that evaluation is hard to do well."[16]

Searching for Precursors to Evaluation Research

Dozier described public relations evaluation research as an innovation in the practice of public relations.[17] As with most innovations that are perceived as complex, the rate of diffusion is slowed.[18] While program evaluation research is one basis for participating in management decision making, perhaps other activities will provide practitioner entre to such decision-making sessions.

Kettering argued that research is a state of mind, an attitude. Kettering said that the research-oriented mind holds a "friendly, welcoming attitude toward change, going out to look for change, instead of waiting for it to come."[19] This attitude in public relations is perhaps best manifest in activities that make up environmental monitoring or environmental scanning.

Environmental scanning includes those formal and informal activities that public relations practitioners use to find out what's going on in the organization's environment. In systems language, environmental scanning is the detection of environmental turbulence or change likely to affect the homeostasis of the system. On a practical level, environmental scanning is fact finding, a sensitivity to "what's going on out there."

Based on theoretical propositions derived from open systems theory, and supported by prior research on program evaluation, the following conceptual hypothesis is posed:

> Practitioners who engage in environmental scanning are more likely to participate in management decision making than practitioners who do not scan.

Before the hypothesis can be operationalized, reliable and valid measures of environmental scanning must first be developed. Then, using different operationalizations of environmental scanning, several operational hypotheses can be posed.

Methods

Both qualitative and quantitative research methods were used to develop an empirically grounded set of measures of environmental scanning. First the practitioner literature was reviewed for items that indicate activities that practitioners do to find out "what's going on out there." Next, a focus group study of practitioners in San Diego was conducted. Practitioners were first prompted with a definition of environmental scanning, then asked to comment at length about activities that they do to scan the organizational environment. Audio recordings of the focus group study were content analyzed to identify statements with face validity as measures of environmental scanning. A series of depth interviews were also conducted with public relations practitioners in San Diego.

Statements from all three sources were combined, then edited to remove duplicate statements. The final set included forty statements. Twenty items reflect formal methods of

scanning; the other 20 items reflect informal techniques of scanning. This stratification of items is based on Robinson's dichotomy between "seat-of-pants" and "scientific" measurement in public relations.[20]

Sample Frame

The universe of study consisted of public relations practitioners; the population consisted of practitioners associated with major professional associations. The sample frame was the 1985 membership directories for the Public Relations Society of America and the International Association of Business Communicators.

Sampling and Response Rate

Systematic sampling with a random start point was used to select a sample from the sample frame. A six-page questionnaire was pilot-tested on a small sample of San Diego practitioners and revised. The questionnaire was mailed to 400 members of PRSA and 400 members of IABC in April, 1985. A second mailing to non-respondents was sent in June 1985. The number of usable questionnaires returned equaled 278. Due to the number of items (40 dedicated to environmental scanning alone) and the preliminary nature of the present research, the relatively low (34.8 percent) response rate was deemed sufficient for this analysis.[21]

Factor Scales for Environmental Scanning

The forty items measuring enviromental scanning used a common 7-point scale to indicate how frequently the practitioner engaged in each environmental scanning activity. The scale ranged from "never" to "always." Principal factoring with iterations was used to extract the initial factor structure. The initial structure was then rotated to a varimax solution.

Two factors accounted for 64.3 percent of the explained variance. The first factor, scientific scanning, accounted for 54.7 percent of the explained variance in the rotated solution. The second factor, informal scanning, accounted for 9.6 percent of the explained variance. Items for the two factors, along with factor loadings for each, are provided in Table 1 and Table 2.

As indicated in Table 1, the first factor closely parallels Robinson's "scientific" mode of research. This style of scanning emphasizes formal studies and surveys. Public opinion research agencies are used and public relations audits are conducted. Demographic data from secondary sources are also used, as are outside consultants.

The second factor, displayed in Table 2, closely parallels the "individualistic" or "seat-of-pants" approach described by Robinson. Practitioners following this style of scanning make phone calls to key members of publics, talk with field personnel, and conduct depth interviews with publics. Such practitioners call people who attend special events, review

Table 1.

Factor One: Scientific Scanning

(Each item is measured on a 7-point scale, ranging from "Never" to "Always")

Factor Loading	Items
.71	I use formal evaluation studies to track public reactions to the organization.
.66	I have surveys conducted of key publics.
.65	I subscribe to or use the services of public opinion research agencies.
.62	I conduct public relations audits to find out about publics.
.53	I use demographic data to help make sensible decisions concerning publics.
.49	I use scientific and non-scientific research methods when gathering information about my organization and its publics.
.46	I hire outside specialists to identify and gather information on my key publics.

Table 2.

Factor Two: Informal Scanning

(Each item is measured on a 7-point scale, ranging from "Never" to "Always")

Factor Loading	Items
.62	I make phone calls to members of my target publics to keep in touch.
.58	I talk with field personnel to find out about key publics.
.54	I conduct depth interviews with members of the organization's publics.
.47	I call back people who attend a special event or presentation my organization has done to get their reactions.
.43	I review complaints via mail and private conferences to find out how publics feel about my organization.
.37	I review newspapers like the Wall Street Journal and USA Today to spot and follow trends in public opinion, industry and business.
.34	I hold work-group meetings with staff or employees that are like quality circles.

complaints, read national newspapers, and organize work-group meetings similar to quality circles. Unlike the first factor, these techniques are qualitative and subjective.

In a study of program evaluation styles, Dozier found

that public relations managers used both scientific impact and seat-of-pants evaluation.[22] Both types of evaluation were correlated with the public relations manager role and, by inference, with participation in management decision making. It is postulated that use of both scientific and informal scanning techniques would be positively correlated with participation in management decision making.

Additive scales were created by computing the mean of item scores for the seven items that make up the scientific scanning factor and the seven items that make up the informal scanning factor. Alpha reliability coefficients were computed for both scales. The scientific scanning scale provided an alpha coefficient of .84 while the informal scanning scale provided an alpha coefficient of .77.

Index for Participation in Management Decision Making

Eight questionnaire items measured practitioner participation in management decision making. Practitioners were asked to indicate how frequently they participated in meetings to decide new policy, to discuss major problems, to adopt new programs, to implement new programs, to discuss results of programs, to discuss public relations strategy, to provide feedback on public opinion, and to meet with outside experts to make important decisions. A seven-point, "never" to "always" scale was used. An additive scale was generated by computing the mean of the eight item scores that make up the scale. The scale, developed by Broom,[23] has proven reliable in several studies. In

the present study, the decision-making scale provided an alpha reliability coefficient of .93.

In addition, abbreviated measures of the public relations manager role and technician role were also made. The four-item manager scale provided an alpha reliability coefficient of .89. The three-item technician scale provided an alpha reliability coefficient of .74.

The five scales permit the testing of relationships posited by theory. First, the two types of environmental scanning activities should be positively related to participation in management decision making. The more a practitioner gathers information about the organizational environment, the more the practitioner can contribute to the decision-making process. Such information gathering can use both scientific and informal approaches.

Second, environmental scanning is posited to be related to the public relations management role function but unrelated to the technician role function. That is, technicians concentrate on generating messages to flow outward from the organization, a one-way model of public relations practice.

Managers, on the other hand, are expected to solve problems between the organization and publics. Such problem solving requires an understanding of "what's going on out there." Managers are posited to continually scan the environment to detect new problems or to monitor progress in solving old problems.

Finally, environmental scanning is posited to provide

access to management decision making, independent of the practitioner's management role in the organization. This proposition argues that scanning activities provide additional access to management decision making, over and above the access provided by the practitioner' managerial role in the organization. By controlling for the contribution of the practitioner's management role activities on access to decision-making sessions, an independent assessment can be made of the contribution of scanning to practitioner access to decision making.

Using the variables described above, the following operational hypotheses were tested.

h1: Practitioner scores on the scientific scanning scale will be positively correlated with participation in management decision making.

h2: Practitioner scores on the informal scanning scale will be positively correlated with participation in management decision making.

h3: Practitioner scores on the scientific scanning scale will be positively correlated with the practitioner's public relations manager role score.

h4: Practitioner scores on the informal scanning scale will be positively correlated with the practitioner's public relations manager role score.

h5: Practitioner scores on the scientific scanning scale will be unrelated to the practitioner's public relations technician role score.

h6: Practitioner scores on the informal scanning scale will be unrelated to the practitioner's public relations technician role score.

h7: Practitioner scores on the scientific scanning scale will be positively correlated with

participation in management decision making after controlling for the influence of the practitioner's manager role score.

h8: Practitioner scores on the informal scanning scale will be positively correlated with participation in management decision making after controlling for the influence of the practitioner's manager role score.

The conservative 99 percent decision rule ($p<.01$) was used to determine the statistical significance of relationships.

Findings

Table 3 displays the results of the statistical tests.

Table 3.

Test of Relations Between Management Decision-Making Participation, Environmental Scanning, and Practitioner Roles

	Scientific Scanning	Informal Scanning
Participation in Management Decision Making	r = +.46 (N = 258) p < .001	r = +.36 (N = 257) p < .001
Public Relations Management Role Score	r = +.34 (N = 257) p < .001	r = +.29 (N = 256) p < .001
Public Relations Technician Role Score	r = +.11 (N = 262) p = .036	r = -.02 (N = 261) p = .404
Participation in Decision Making, Controlling for Manager Role Score	corr. = +.36 (N = 241) p < .001	corr. = +.28 (N = 241) p < .001

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to test hypotheses one through six. Hypotheses seven and eight were tested using partial correlation coefficients.

Both scientific and informal scanning are positively and significantly correlated with participation in management decision making. Both scientific and informal scanning are positively and significantly correlated with the practitioner's managerial role activities, using the 99 percent decision rule. Neither scientific nor informal scanning are correlated with the practitioner's technical role activities. A positive correlation of some strength is detected in the sample between the technical role scale and scientific scanning. However, the relationship is not strong enough in the sample to be generalized to the practitioner population at a 99-percent level of confidence. In terms of explained variance, the technician role scores account for less than two percent of the variance in scientific scanning activities.

The relationship between scientific and informal scanning and management decision making remains strong, even after the influence of managerial role playing by the practitioner is controlled. This confirmation of the independent influence of environmental scanning on practitioner participation in management decision making (controlling for managerial role playing by the practitioner) is suggestive of two rival causal models and poses important implications for further research.

Rival Models for Scanning, Roles and Decision Making

How does environmental scanning interact with role playing to propel the practitioner into organizational governance, into management decision making? One model is consistent with Kettering's argument that research is a state of mind. This model posits that environmental scanning is causally antecedent to public relations management role playing. That is, an entry-level practitioner may possess both the curiosity and the training to decipher "what's going on out there." This scanning-based intelligence about the organization's environment is factored into the low-level, technical activities that the entry-level practitioner conducts during early years of professional practice. Because the practitioner knows "what's going on out there," he or she begins to be regarded as "expert" on public relations problems (expert prescription). The scanning activities of the practitioner creates opportunities for management to listen to publics and publics to listen to management (communication facilitation). Environmental scanning intelligence is useful to management when solutions are sought to problems. The practitioner becomes useful to management at spelling out alternative strategies for solving problems (problem-solving process facilitation). Expert prescription, communication facilitation, and problem-solving process facilitation are the conceptual components of the public relations manager role. This model argues that environmental scanning is a logical precursor and causally antecedent to management role playing by practitioners.

A second model argues the opposite causal relationship. The practitioner, according to this second model, evolves into the public relations manager role through professional maturation, as indicated by years of professional experience and other factors. As the practitioner takes on expanded manager role responsibilities, the need to determine "what's going on out there" increases. Role responsibilities, then, cause the public relations manager to spend additional time in environmental scanning activities. These scanning activities are necessary in order to be effective at the expert prescription, communication facilitation, and problem-solving process facilitation that organizations expect of public relations managers. Scanning behavior is caused by the manager role playing of the practitioner.

The present, cross-sectional study does not permit empirical resolution of these rival explanations for the same correlation between role playing and environmental scanning. The present study does, however, provide evidence that scanning and role playing contribute independently to the practitioner's participation in management decision making. Managers are more likely to participate in decision making sessions than technicians, but environmental scanners are likely to be participants in management decision making, regardless of their practitioner roles. The relationship between scanning and decision-making participation cannot be explained away by saying that managers scan their organization's environment more often than do technicans.

This finding has important implications. The ascension of practitioners to the manager role is limited by the hierarchical structure of the organization, the position of the public relations unit in that hierarchy, and the position of the practitioner within the substructure of the public relations unit. If participation in management decision making were solely a function of manager role status, that single door to organizational governance might take many years and much hierarchical restructuring and manuevering to open.

Environmental scanning, on the other hand, may provide a useful back door for participation in management decision making. Any practitioner can initiate informal scanning activities (see Table 2). The activities of scientific scanning (see Table 1) may require the services of outside vendors (commercial research firms, for example) but can be budgeted without requiring the hierarchical re-ordering of the public relations unit within the organizational structure. To rephrase Koten's statement in the introduction to this report, the environmental scanner has the hard data that are the poker chips of management participation and decision making. The scanner may parlay these chips, these hard data gleaned from environmental scanning, into managerial responsibilities.

The findings of this study suggest possible directions for further research.

Implications for Further Research

Causal modeling of relations between scanning, roles, and decision making can be tested through data collected from a representative panel of public relations practitioners at several different points in time. By designing a panel sample statified by years of professional experience (0-2 years, 5-7 years, 10-12 years, for example), scanning (informal and scientific), roles (technican and manager), and decision making can be measured in a benchmark survey. Several years later, the panel could be surveyed again, measuring the same set of variables. By using cross-lag correlation, empirical evidence can be gathered indicating the strength of causal relations between scanning, roles, and decision making.

These three concepts do not operate independent of a host of other factors which influence the public relations function within organizations. These other factors include the complexity and turbulence of the organizational environmental, the dominance-cooperation ideology of the management core, the size and structure of the organization, and the predominant model of public relations (press agentry, public information, two-way asymmetric, and two-way symmetric). Measures of these attributes should also be included in future research and controlled for in the analysis of the three focal concepts of scanning, roles, and decision making.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Interview with John A. Koten by the author on May 23, 1986, Illinois Bell, Chicago, Illinois.

[2] Scott M. Cutlip, Allen H. Center, and Glen M. Broom, Effective Public Relations, sixth edition (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1985), p. 187.

[3] Cutlip, Center and Broom, op. cit., p. 191.

[4] Sue H. Bell and Eugene C. Bell, "Public Relations: Functional or Functionary?" Public Relations Review, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Summer 1976), pp. 51-52.

[5] Cutlip, Center and Broom, op. cit., p. 258.

[6] James E. Grunig and Todd Hunt, Managing Public Relations (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1984), p. 42.

[7] Cutlip, Center and Broom, op. cit., p. 178.

[8] Grunig and Hunt, op. cit., p. 124.

[9] Glen M. Broom and David M. Dozier, "Advancement for Public Relations Role Models," Public Relations Review, Vol. 12, No. 1 (Spring 1986), pp. 37-57.

[10] David M. Dozier, "Program Evaluation and the Roles of Practitioners," Public Relations Review, Vol. 10, No. 2 (Summer 1984), pp. 13-21.

[11] Edward J. Robinson, Public Relations and Survey Research (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969), pp. 11-12.

[12] Broom and Dozier, op. cit., p. 30.

[13] James E. Grunig, "Basic research Provides Knowledge That Makes Evaluation Possible," Public Relations Quarterly, Vol. 28, No. 3 (Fall 1983), p. 28.

[14] Allen H. Center and Glen M. Broom, "Evaluation Research," Public Relations Quarterly, Vol. 28, No. 3 (Fall 1983), p. 2.

[15] David M. Dozier, "Planning and Evaluation in Public Relations Practice," Public Relations Review, Vol. 11, No. 2 (Summer 1985), p. 18.

[16] Byron Reeves, "Now You See Them, Now You Don't: Demonstrating Effects of Communication Programs," Public Relations Quarterly, Vol. 28, No. 3 (Fall 1983), p. 17.

[17] David M. Dozier, "The Diffusion of Evaluation Methods Among Public Relations Practitioners." Paper presented to the Public Relations Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, August 9, 1981.

[18] Everett M. Rogers, Diffusion of Innovations, third edition (New York: The Free Press, 1983), p. 230.

[19] "More Music Please, Composers," Saturday Evening Post, Vol. 211, No. 32 (1938). This article is cited by Scott M. Cutlip and Allen H. Center, Effective Public Relations, fifth edition (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1978), pp. 143-144. The viewpoint summarizes the essence of the argument for seeking precursors of program evaluation in the ativities of practitioners.

[20] Edward J. Robinson, Public Relations and Survey Research, op. cit., pp. 11-13.

[21] Data were entered into a CYBER 170-750 mainframe computer. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Version 9, was used for all analysis. See Norman H. Nie and others, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, second edition (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975).

[22] Dozier, "The Diffusion of Evaluation Methods," op. cit., p. 19.

[23] This measure of participation in decision making was developed by Broom through a 1979 grant from the Foundation for Public Relations Research and Education. The results of this study are reported in Glen M. Broom, "A Comparison of Sex Roles in Public Relations," Public Relations Review, Vol. 8, No. 3 (Fall 1982), pp. 17-22.

[24] Dozier, "The Diffusion of Evaluation Methods," op. cit., p. 20.